

These are the Guilty

Address

Delivered by

CARLETON PUTNAM

Copies of this address, "These are the Guilty"
may be obtained at the following prices:

- 1 to 2 copies - free
- 3 to 99 copies - 18¢ each
- 100 or more copies - 15¢ each

Copies of Dr. W. C. George's
"The Biology Of The Race Problem"
are available as follows:

- 1 to 9 copies - 50¢ each
- 10 to 99 copies - 40¢ each
- 100 or more copies - 35¢ each

NATIONAL PUTNAM LETTERS COMMITTEE
P. O. Box 3518, Grand Central Station
New York City 17, New York

Before the

WASHINGTON PUTNAM LETTERS CLUB

February 12, 1963

Printed and Distributed as a Public Service
by the
NATIONAL PUTNAM LETTERS COMMITTEE

On Lincoln's birthday the Putnam Letters Club of Washington, D.C., an affiliate of the National Putnam Letters Committee, sponsored a dinner for its members and guests in the grand ballroom of the Willard Hotel. Clifford Newell, president of the club, presided.

In spite of adverse weather conditions throughout the Virginia-Maryland area, the ballroom was crowded to overflowing and many late arrivals were forced to eat in adjoining rooms.

After the presentation of the colors and an invocation by the Chaplain of the United States Senate, Mr. Putnam addressed the gathering.

NATIONAL PUTNAM LETTERS COMMITTEE
P. O. Box 3518, Grand Central Station
New York 17, New York
MARK H. GERMAN, *Director*

These are the Guilty

Address

Delivered by

CARLETON PUTNAM

Before the

WASHINGTON PUTNAM LETTERS CLUB

February 12, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Mr. German, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

Let me begin by acknowledging a debt—a debt of gratitude and appreciation to Clifford Newell and Mark German for arranging this impressive meeting tonight. An attendance of over 600 is more than any of us expected, especially in the face of an ice storm in Maryland and Virginia. I'm proud and grateful to your committee for inviting me to speak here, and I'm proud and grateful to *you* for coming.

It's true that about two years ago I wrote a short book—hardly more than a monograph—called *Race and Reason* which has caused some controversy. A few attacks have even been made on it. Therefore, every now and then, friends of mine, here and there, have been good enough to give me a platform—like this one tonight—from which to answer those attacks.

So far it hasn't been an overwhelming task. I won't say that I expected a somewhat higher caliber of opposition, for that might be discourteous to our opponents. But there are only a few loose ends to clean up this evening, and then, ladies and gentlemen, I propose to launch an attack of my own. If I were a lay preacher I would take as my text the sixteenth chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark those who cause divisions and offenses in opposition to the doctrine which you

have learned. . . . For such persons . . . by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

I propose to suggest to you tonight, in this world of rising racial tensions, just who they are who have caused divisions and—however sincere their motives and beliefs—have deceived the hearts of the simple. And in view of the fact that the last time I made a speech one of the press services complained because I referred to a certain individual "whom I did not name", tonight I intend to name names—not all, indeed, because large organizations are involved—but enough to satisfy the press. And I intend to say to you, and to them: these are the guilty.

But first let's go back to where it all began. I suppose nobody in this room doubts that the crusade for racial integration and the claim that races are all alike has its roots in the same soil in which most of the left-wing movements of our time originated. The socialism of Saint-Simon in France, of Marx in England and Germany, of Lenin in Russia, the Fabian Society of Bernard Shaw and the Webbs in England, all were, at least in part, an attempt to meet a horrifying problem among those who worked primarily with their muscles and their hands. They all had one valid common denominator among their objectives—improving the condition of the poor.

I will go so far as to say that many of us here, facing the situation that reformers found in England in the eighteen fifties and sixties, would have thought and felt exactly as they did. Here is the death notice in the London papers of Mary Anne Walkley, 20 years old, who in June of 1863 after sewing in a dressmaking establishment an average day of 16½ hours—during the season often 30 hours at a stretch—simply died of overwork. The doctor's words at the inquest were: "Mary Anne Walkley died from long hours of work in an overcrowded room . . ." Because she could not stop for Death, Death kindly stopped for her.

As for the food the poor ate, their bread was bought mostly from what were called the under-sellers and was adulterated with alum, soap, pearl ashes, chalk and Derbyshire stone-dust. Here is a description taken from official reports concerning conditions in the baking trade: "He [the poor man] had to eat daily in his bread a certain quantity of human perspiration mixed with the discharge of abscesses, cobwebs, dead black-beetles, and putrid German yeast, without counting alum and sand." Of course, many of the poor simply starved. It wasn't until well along in the next century that the government stopped publishing statistics of deaths from starvation in London for lack of casualties.

Forgive this repetition of what will be to many of you an old story, but it seemed wise to refresh our recollections concerning the origin of today's left-wing ideologies. In those times and in those conditions were born all sorts of emotional attitudes and intellectual concepts, as well as practical schemes. Some of them succeeded and some of them did not, but progress was certainly made. The radical of 1963 inherits a legacy which we must understand. A year or so ago a reporter for *Time* magazine interviewed me on the race question and it wasn't until our talk was practically over that I finally managed to make him give me *his* view on the subject. He was from the South and he was an integrationist. As he spoke, tears welled up in his eyes. But I could tell from what he said that those tears didn't have their source in the Negro problem, which he hadn't really thought through. They were part of the old legacy. They went back much further than Mary Anne Walkley.

There is no reason to doubt the humanitarian purpose of many of the welfare movements of those earlier days or to question their considerable accomplishments. Much poverty has been relieved. The problem now is to keep the floor under misery and failure without slapping a ceil-

ing on everybody else—and to winnow out the large company of those who use the cry of humanity and brotherly love as an excuse for creating legal ways to break the Eighth Commandment. But that is a topic for a different forum from ours tonight.

I want to touch on only one aspect of that problem which leads us directly into our own field. Implicit in much left-wing theory and rhetoric, because it seemed to make existing conditions all the more reprehensible and in need of correction, was the doctrine of the equality of man. Few socialists ever took the doctrine seriously in practice, I doubt if the Fabians ever took it seriously in theory, but we have all heard the slogans of the French revolution and the Declaration of Independence.

I shan't go over again here what the evidence clearly shows regarding Jefferson's meaning—both as to the word "men" and as to the word "equal" in the phrase "all men are created equal"—nor need I repeat Hamilton's recognition that liberty and equality are mutually exclusive. It is obvious the founding fathers had no illusions about the equality of men in any sense except in equal rights to justice, and the Negro was not included even in that. But in America as the years went on, helped by the controversial Franz Boas, the notion of a Utopian social, economic and even biological equality persisted as a sort of demagogic fetish until things reached the point where the Swedish socialist Myrdal actually dared to write in his *American Dilemma* that in the conflict between liberty and equality in the United States "equality is slowly winning", and Handlin, the Harvard professor, could bring himself to declare: "There is no evidence of any inborn differences of temperament, personality, character, or intelligence among races."

This last remark lands us finally in the middle of our subject with a splash. For the benefit

of the press I give the full name, Oscar Handlin, Professor of History at Harvard University, and while again I do not impugn his motives or sincerity, I assert that in my opinion Handlin's declaration is one of the most groundless and dangerously misleading statements to be found in print today.

Let us quickly review the evidence. All that we need is contained in that short, concise little book, *The Biology of the Race Problem*, which I shall cite hereafter simply as the George Report. In spite of the example of the equalitarians, a thousand pages are not required to come to the point on this subject.

If you will consult Section IV of the George Report you will note the findings of Bean, Connolly and Vint on the differences in frequencies of occurrence of certain features of White and Negro brains. The importance of these differences is plainly set out in quotations and citations from and to Penfield, Halstead, Brodmann and Herrick. I repeat: you will find it all in the space of ten pages in Section IV. If you want more data, I can refer you to the leading article in the *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 4, which amplifies and still further documents Dr. George's material. The differences in question are physical and hereditary. That they account for differences in temperament, behavior and intelligence between the two races is beyond doubt. That these differences make the amalgamation of the races undesirable is just as clear. All the other sections of the George Report confirm these facts.

There isn't time enough tonight to discuss the full report. But I will call your attention to something on which Dr. George does not touch: In 1940 the illegitimacy rate for Negroes throughout the United States was eight and a half times the rate for Whites. Nineteen years later, nineteen years in which Americans have struggled hard to raise Negro standards, the rate is ten times that for Whites. In other words, as their environment

has been improved, their performance has gone down. Taking the single state of Virginia in the twenty years between 1938 and 1958, the White illegitimacy rate declined slightly from 2.6 to 2.3 per cent. In this same period which witnessed astonishing gains in Negro education, Negro housing, Negro income and Negro job opportunities, the rate of Negro illegitimacy increased from 19.5 to 22.9 per cent. This is difficult to explain if the Negro's limitations are due solely to his environment.

Speaking of explanations, it's going to be still more difficult for the professors to evade Bean, Connolly and Vint. They've already begun to say: "Oh, but the samplings aren't adequate." [These samplings varied from 30 brains in some cases to 165 in others.] Well, I have a question to ask these professors and all those who criticize the George Report on this most vital point. If you don't like the samplings of Bean, Connolly and Vint, why have you never produced anything better? You have most of the money, you have the captive foundations—they have hundreds of millions—and there are plenty of other sources anxious to help you. Yet to the best of my knowledge you haven't even *tried* to assemble any contrary evidence. Don't tell us that you can't be bothered or that this isn't important. This is the most important point in the whole controversy. Either the Negro's limitations are innate or they're not, and this evidence settles the matter. So I ask again, why have you never even tried to produce any other samplings?

The answer is simple. You haven't tried because you don't dare. You know well enough what the results would be, provided you had an objective study and included a Dr. George or two on the panel. I suggest that you now make such a study—a series of any size you like of average West African Negro brains, because there you get the least diluted essence of the Negro, against a series of average White brains—the

study to be jointly run by scientists on both sides of the question. Meanwhile we have Bean, Connolly and Vint, Penfield, Halstead, Brodmann and Herrick. I dislike being rude to amiable Harvard professors but I must say to Oscar Handlin (and I'm going to say it to several others this evening): the time has come to put up or shut up. Either answer Bean, Connolly and Vint or explain to the public why you can't.

While I'm on the subject of the George Report I have another suggestion to offer. The press quotes George F. Carter, a professor of geography at Johns Hopkins University, as having said about this report: "The arguments they put up in that booklet are Swiss cheese—full of holes." It so happens that early last fall a mutual acquaintance communicated to me Carter's complaints about the George Report—this acquaintance listed fifty of them, acting as a sort of agent for Carter. I considered these fifty points carefully, and then I submitted them to Dr. George. Thereafter they were submitted to scholars in New York. All of this occurred before the Putnam Committee undertook the distribution of the report, and it was unanimously decided that, apart from three or four points about which some shadow of argument might be made but which did not bear on any essentials, the fifty points were without any substance whatsoever.

There was one item which Carter considered to be a quotation out of context and which we corrected with an erratum sheet. Jerry Doolittle of the *Washington Post* made much out of this correction in the *Post* for December 9. So I have a question to ask Doolittle: Assuming Carter is right in his statement that differing climates had identical effects in the way they "sharpened the wits" of all mankind, can either you or Carter honestly believe that the climate of the tropics and the climate of northern Europe over tens of thousands of years had identical effects on the development of those special qualities of the civi-

lized forebrain, namely, foresight and long-range planning? Carter's dwelling on one aspect of molding does not exclude the existence of other aspects. If Doolittle thinks it does, he had better consult someone else besides a geographer. He will find experts on *that* subject in other sections of the George Report.

But let me come to Carter's fifty points and give you two examples: On page 27 of his report, Dr. George cites the work of Bean which was published in 1906. On this Carter remarks: "Reference from Bean is nearly sixty years old. Haven't there been any developments or thoughts in this long period?" If Carter had read the Report with any attention he would have found that Connolly's work was published in 1950 and Penfield's in 1957. This brings Bean right up to date. But are we in some sort of competition here on dates? Does its date make Newton's law of gravitation invalid?

Secondly on page 68 Dr. George writes: "If there were more Negroes with talents for civilization, we would have no race problem or it would be a very different one." To which Carter remarks: "Again nonsense. Boston had a race problem with the Irish. Many people have a Jewish race problem even though these races have talents for civilization". Well, ladies and gentlemen, is not this what Dr. George has already just said? He has just said, "or it would be a very different one." And that is precisely what the Irish and Jewish problems were, "very different ones".

I leave you to judge where the nonsense lies in these two examples, and I invite Carter to publish in the newspapers all of his fifty criticisms of the George Report, just as he has seen fit to publish his Swiss cheese. I have a science degree but I am not a professional scientist and I do not debate with professional scientists. However, I dare say scientists can be found who will answer Carter—also in the press. I simply suggest to

Carter that he prepare better criticisms than the ones our mutual acquaintance submitted to me, unless he wants to lose the game by a score of fifty to nothing. And I warn him that before he can walk with Alice in the Wonderland of unbridled environmentalism he must first get by the narrow gate of Bean, Connolly, Vint and Penfield. I could have sat next to Caruso for dinner every night for a lifetime and never sung as Caruso sang. No amount of cultural contact, no amount of integration would have made the slightest difference, except that if I had tried to sing with Caruso I would have spoiled the opera. And what is true of the vocal chords is true of the frontal lobes.

Out at the University of Chicago, there is another professor who thinks he can brush Dr. George aside. For the benefit of the press, let me name him, Manning Nash, Associate Professor of Anthropology. Nash had begun by attacking *Race and Reason* in a long article in *Current Anthropology* last June which was answered by me in a few short sentences on Bean, Connolly and Vint which I put in a letter I sent to Sol Tax, editor of the magazine. Thereupon Nash wrote me saying he doubted if my letter would ever be published so he was going to answer me right off privately. He proceeded to ignore all the substantive issues by calling Dr. George, who is considerably above him in academic status, "unscientific", and then he urged me to read the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation so that I might learn something about the legal equality of all human beings.

To Nash I answered: "Regarding your paragraph on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, you appear never really to have read *Race and Reason*, or much American history. Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration, refutes you on page 62, lines 4-8, of *Race and Reason*; Lincoln refutes you on pages 8-9. It so happens that

Lincoln was a lawyer and you are not. Until the aberration of the 1954 Supreme Court decision no competent lawyer supposed that there was any 'legal' right on the part of the federal government to force Negroes into White schools. And that Court reached its decision on sociological and pseudo-scientific rather than legal grounds."

But to get back to the George Report, when this report was first issued there appeared in many newspapers throughout the South, by some sort of spontaneous combustion, an answer from a man named Charles C. Perkins, Chairman of the Department of Psychology at Emory University in Atlanta. Perkins was very patronizing, very sure that no even moderately reputable psychologist would come up with findings such as the report contained, quite forgetting Dr. Garrett, for fifteen years head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia and a past president of the American Psychological Association. Perkins then went on to remark that while there "just aren't many facts that allow positive conclusions" and while he didn't want even his rebuttal evidence to be taken too seriously, nevertheless "Alpha examinations given World War I soldiers indicated the average northern Negro was smarter than the average southern White man."

It is difficult to understand Perkins' willingness to use this material even with apologies. This is the well known and long discredited Klineburg Twist, and for the benefit of the press I am referring to Otto Klineburg, Professor of Psychology at Columbia University. What Klineburg did in this case was to take the four Southern states where the White averages were *lowest* and compare them with the four Northern states where the Negro averages were *highest*. If we take the Whites in the same Northern states as the Negroes, these Whites scored far above the Negroes. It's an old equalitarian trick to compare the best of one group with the worst of another and, of course, such a procedure has no validity whatever. If you

take an above-average Negro and give him a lot of advantages he will do better than a below-average White man who has had very few. Whenever you have overlapping statistical distributions, the top of one will always exceed the bottom of the other. This is not the problem under discussion. The thing we are interested in is what the average Negro will do when compared with the average White man under like conditions. Anyone interested in the latter question will find decisive answers in the George Report. This is the only issue, and it is the issue Perkins is clouding and confusing. I urge you in dealing with these people to keep them to the point. Their specialty is irrelevance.

I might say that I think the championship in this respect goes this year to a man up at the University of Connecticut. I refer to one Donald C. Simmons who is listed as a member of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. It would hardly seem proper to take your time with this 36-year old assistant professor were it not for the fact that *The New Republic* magazine has seen fit on two separate occasions to publish his attacks which now include both *Race and Reason* and the George Report.

My first brush with Simmons occurred last summer when *The New Republic* printed a review by him of *Race and Reason* in which he accused me of quoting scientists out of context. When I asked him for one example he was able to give none. Perhaps he was basing his criticism on hearsay from an article by Howard Margolis of *Science* magazine. Margolis made the same accusation, and when asked to provide an example gave my quotation from Kluckhohn on page 51 of *Race and Reason*. I answered this accusation in a letter which *Science* published. I also answered it in a speech in New Orleans a year ago. I have heard nothing from Margolis since. And I doubt if I hear any more on this subject from Simmons either.

Simmons' most recent effort appeared in *The New Republic* for January 5 and is of a somewhat more specific nature. He begins by referring to the George Report and the measurement of intelligence by brain size. Simmons mentions a group of male Negro brains which he says were found to weigh more than a certain group of female White brains. You will remember that on page 61 of the George Report there is a footnote which reads in part as follows: "The essential point here is that, *other things being equal*, [such as sulcification and microscopic structure of the cortex] and considering higher animals in general perspective the larger the brain relative to body size, the greater the intelligence." Note the phrase "relative to body size". Among other factors, the average body size of women is notably smaller than that of men. Thus their brain size would be expected to be smaller without lessening of intelligence. Apparently we have another case here of a man who hasn't read with any attention what he's attacking.

Next Simmons dances the Klineburg Twist, about which no more need be said, and then he gives us a quotation from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues which reads as follows: "... the more comparable the background of White and Negro groups, the less the difference in intelligence." However, if you will turn to the *American Psychologist* magazine for May of 1962 you will find that Dr. Garrett answered that statement by showing that there have been six studies on the subject and *all* of them contradict the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

Our Connecticut friend then moves on to comment about some experiments in Baltimore purporting to show that no difference can be found between White and Negro infants up to 40 weeks, and that differences thereafter must be due to socio-economic factors. But the lower centers of the brain and nervous system, in human

beings and in animals, are the ones which mature first; the higher centers mature last. Therefore similarity of performance in the early stages of life signifies nothing as to adult potentiality.

Finally Simmons remarks on what he calls the racist accusation that the Negro never invented an alphabet and points out that many other races didn't either. But if he will read the *Biology of the Race Problem* he will see that George makes no such accusation. George says that the Negro never invented a *system of writing*. It is true that alphabets are rare. Systems of writing are not. The Negro never invented either. I shan't weary you further with Simmons. My only comment must be one of surprise at the acceptance of this sort of material for the second time by *The New Republic*.

Well, we've had a look at Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Chicago, Emory and the University of Connecticut. Let's return to Harvard for a moment, the university where the FBI had to arrest Zborowski, a research associate in the Department of Anthropology. I do not mention this in any criticism of the department at Harvard. It might have happened anywhere. I cite it as an example of how important the communists consider it to be to corrupt the minds of our young people in this field.

The *New York Times* on December 9, 1962, ran a review of Dr. Carleton Coon's book, *The Origin of Races*. This review was written by Professor William W. Howells, Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Harvard. Up until the last two paragraphs Howells sticks to his subject and I have no comments to make. However, in the last two paragraphs he launches a thinly veiled attack upon my pamphlet, *Evolution and Race: New Evidence*. He opens the first of these paragraphs with the remark that certain parts of Coon's book have been "pounced on with delight by the present cohort of racists". This opening gambit is the usual introduction used

by these people in order to arouse anger rather than reason in their readers. If a man acknowledges the facts of race, he's a racist. I suppose if he acknowledges the facts of sex he's a sexist.

But I move on. Howells next says that *even if Coon is correct*, it is not possible to use his hypothesis to measure modern racial differences. Let's think about that for a moment. If Coon is correct, the Caucasian race passed the threshold of evolutionary development in brain structure from *Homo erectus* to *Homo sapiens* 200,000 years ahead of the Negro. This matter of brain structure is biological, inherent, hereditary. Evolution is a continuing process. If one race has a head start of 200,000 years over another, does Howells mean to suggest that this head start has no significance—does he see no possible relation between it and the differences found by Bean, Connolly and Vint in White and Negro brains, or the results of intelligence tests, or the figures on crime and illegitimacy, or the level of civilization in Haiti, or the stability of governments in the Congo? Nobody is trying to take a pair of calipers and declare what is the exact measure of difference in the two races today. But I will tell Howells it makes *enough* difference to the Southern mother when she puts her girls in school.

This amiable Harvard professor, furthermore, is not above playing a guessing game in these final paragraphs. At one place he refers to a passage from page ix of the introduction to Coon's book which reads as follows: "It is a fair inference . . . that the subspecies which crossed the evolutionary threshold into the category of *Homo Sapiens* the earliest have evolved the most and that the obvious correlation between the length of time a subspecies has been in the *sapiens* state and the levels of civilization attained by some of its populations may be related phenomena." On this passage Howells makes the comment in parenthesis: "Those who are so tickled

with page ix of the introduction might try continuing to page 661."

Of course the average reader of Howells' review will not have at hand a copy of *The Origin of Races* and hence will not be able to evaluate the parenthesis because he will have no access to page 661. Does Howells intend to leave the implication of some contradiction? Page 661 deals both with selection and with the tendency to eventual resegregation of genetic characters in racial interbreeding. I wonder if Howells supposes this to be compensation to Southern society which, after many generations of chaos, might look forward to such an eventuality. Thereafter the chaos would start all over again.

And while we're jumping about from page to page I might call Howells' attention to page 336. I shan't keep you in the dark about what is on that page. Here Coon refers to "the great variability of twentieth century human beings, *in evolutionary grades* [emphasis mine] as well as in racial lines". Coon calls these differences important. He also says that from the perspective of life as a whole, they are slight. Obviously if you run the gamut from the amoeba to man they are slight. But what a whale of a difference a few brain cells make! You can find *that* discussed in the George Report at page 34.

Finally our amiable Harvard professor sums up his view of my pamphlet in this extraordinarily penetrating remark: "Anyhow I see no way of using such arguments [the 200,000 year evolutionary lag] to disprove the Constitution of the United States." Would anyone in the audience care to tell me where the Constitution mentions the integration of schools? If we look at the Fourteenth Amendment, do we see any reference to schools? Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to share with you a not very well kept secret. The people who put the integration of schools into the Constitution were Howells and his kind, the equalitarian anthropologists and sociologists who mis-

led the Supreme Court and the American people with their mess of half-truths and slanted evidence.

I say now to Howells and all his crowd: You have not only misled the Supreme Court and the American people, you have fooled the Negro about himself. You have poisoned his mind with expectations that cannot be realized and inflamed him with an arrogance that has no justification. You have set him against the White man. You have made him think he has a grudge against the White race when the truth is he owes the White race a greater debt than he can ever repay. Offer a few Negroes one-way tickets to Africa, where they can enjoy the culture of their own race, and see how many takers you get.

I tell you without fear of contradiction that the American people are as kindly a people as any in the world, that nowhere else in the world would Negroes in such numbers have found a better haven. Yet James Baldwin and these much publicized "angry black men" writing books and long articles for the *New Yorker* magazine damn the White American. Baldwin writes pityingly about his ancestor who was dragged to America in chains. But I say to Baldwin that if his ancestor had not been brought here in chains, he would have died a far more terrible death as a slave in Africa. Baldwin is lucky to be here.

And I say to Leopold Stokowski that I revere him as a musician but when he appears on David Susskind's "Open End" TV program and declares that the White man owes the Negro an apology he is guilty of a groundless and inflammatory statement on a subject about which he is incorrectly informed. He is encouraging the Negro to violence and revenge against a race to which the Negro owes an infinite debt.

In this matter Susskind and Stokowski and other public figures across the nation run blindly with the pack. Yet standing here tonight it is not primarily these that I indict, nor *The New Republic* nor even the Supreme Court. Least of

all is it the average Negro. I indict the men who have fooled and goaded the Negro—the men who have made it necessary for the rest of us to point out truths which the Negro might otherwise have been spared the telling. I indict the Howells, the Nashes, the Perkins, the Carters, the Klinebergs, the Handlins, the Herskovitses, the Simmonses, and the Sol Taxes who have spawned our racial tension here and abroad.

And I indict their associations. These men indeed run in packs. They have provided the basis for this whole house of cards that is starting to fall around their heads. If White settlers are being dispossessed and murdered in Kenya, if nuns are being raped in the Congo, if White men and girls are being slugged on the streets of our Northern cities, if the Supreme Court has to warn its employees about going home at night, look to the source. "Mark those who cause divisions and offenses . . . and deceive the hearts of the simple."

Here I would like to incorporate by reference what I said a year ago in New Orleans (in "The Road to Reversal") about my exchange of correspondence with the president of the American Anthropological Association, Sherwood Washburn. Then I would like to ask: Have I now given you enough cases to demonstrate the utter lack of facts on the equalitarian side of this controversy and the poverty of their arguments? Out of all these universities and the resolutions of these associations not one iota of evidence or one shred of argument has come that cannot be exploded in thirty seconds. It is all as stale and empty as the notion that the sun revolves around the earth.

Have I also provided enough illustrations of the way these scientists operate? Because, if not, I could go on. I could mention the fact that on one occasion when a certain scientific association was about to pass a resolution condemning *Race and Reason* there was a pause in the proceed-

ings. And someone asked for a show of hands, on how many had read the book. In a room full of people how many do you suppose had read it? Three. And yet they were about to pass, and did pass, a resolution damning something they'd never read. Does that episode need any further comment from me?

Listen to what the man who was for fifteen years head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia University (he was a member of the faculty for thirty years) has to say about these political resolutions by scientists. I quote you Henry Garrett in a letter to me last October:

"I knew Franz Boas personally. I was able to observe the influence of Boas as founder of the science of anthropology in America and to evaluate the extent to which Boas' socialistic ideology dominated his thinking and permeated the teaching of his disciples, first at Columbia and later at other universities fed from the Boas cult. I was also able to observe the increasing degree of control exercised by this cult over students and younger professors until fear of loss of jobs or status became common in the field of anthropology unless conformity to the racial equality dogma was maintained.

"I will go so far as to assert that the supporters of the equality dogma in science in America today fall into three classes—those who are intimidated, those who are driven by left-wing political motives and those who are honest but mistaken humanitarians. I can testify from repeated personal observation to the intimidation and to the pall of suppression which has fallen upon the academic world in the area of which I speak. It encompasses not only anthropology but certain other related sciences. In the light of this situation the resolutions are not surprising."

Dr. Robert Gayre has told me that not since the days of Galileo has science seen anything like it. When Simmons reviewed *Race and Reason*, he asked if I were looking for an "apostate" anthropologist. You know what that word means. An apostate is one who departs from a dogma. Here, in other words, is one of the younger generation who doesn't even realize his self-betrayal

—who has never learned that science is a matter of research and facts, not dogma.

In the face of this grotesque state of affairs I'd like to ask the Kennedy brothers a question. Next to population control, the race problem is undoubtedly the most urgent in the world today; it is basic to everything else, even to the cold war. Do you, or do you not, consider it desirable that you inform yourselves on both sides of this matter? All your lives you have been listening to political propaganda masquerading under the name of science. It would take you less than an hour to read Section IV of the George Report and the article in the *Mankind Quarterly*, less than an hour to talk to Dr. George or Dr. Garrett. Have you done either?

The decision of the Supreme Court does not relieve you from studying the subject. You've seen what that decision has done to the nation. You are not President and Attorney General solely for the Negro population or the Northern or Western radicals. You also happen to be serving millions of people who believe the decision was viciously wrong and who know more about the matter firsthand than you'll ever know. Why have you never given a hearing to the scientists on their side? Are you afraid of losing some votes? Are you afraid of the Catholic Church? I have been told that this is the case, but I refuse to believe it. Any man who buys a vote by doing the wrong thing, or the ignorant thing, in a job like yours is on the skids of history, and you're smart enough to know it. And as for the Supreme Court, it would switch fast enough if you discovered the truth and went out and told it on the mountain. The American majority would respond with a roar and these minority-group arguments would vanish like last year's snow.

Stop and think for a minute. You have the record of the centuries and of today in Africa, you have the facts in certain countries of South America and you have them in Haiti. In the

United States you have crime records and you have illegitimacy records. You also have forty years of intelligence tests. All these point in one direction, namely, that the Negro has created his history and environment (not vice versa) and will create it again wherever he's allowed to. Next you have the microscopic studies of Vint, the morphology of Bean, Connolly, Halstead and Penfield, and the recent evidence presented by Dr. Coon, president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists. You have pages of other evidence in the George Report. Finally you know the background of the equalitarian school, you know who started it and the political and social views of most of its leaders. All of *this* points in one direction.

For each of the above items some far-fetched excuse might be conceived. Any one of them might possibly be debated. But consider them all together.

Let me suggest a parallel. You are walking along a hotel corridor and as you pass a bedroom door you hear loud, angry voices. Then you hear one of the voices say, "Take that, you dirty dog!" and you hear two shots and the sound of a body falling. So you open the door and you find one man standing with a smoking gun in his hand, looking down at another man with two bullets in his heart.

After some personal risk and minor injuries you manage to capture the man with the gun and, at the trial, the following facts develop. The dead man was shortly to have married his childhood sweetheart and was said by several witnesses to have been joyful over this, having courted her long and earnestly. Further it appears that the dead man, the week before, had inherited a million dollars, after taxes, from an uncle he had never seen. The accused, on the other hand, according to reliable testimony, had coveted the dead man's sweetheart and had been repulsed by her. In fact, he had several times sworn he would kill the

deceased. The gun is found to have been the property of the accused.

The defense pleads that the death is a suicide. The point is made that the dead man might just conceivably have changed his mind about his fiancée and have become depressed at the thought of marriage. As for the million dollars, after taxes, this might not have been enough to compensate for the death of the uncle he had never seen. Regarding the remark, "Take that, you dirty dog!", this may have been the deceased talking to himself. Upon your telling the court that you knew the voice of the dead man with whom you had been associated for many years and that the voice was not his, the defense replies that the deceased was only 30 years old and his voice may have been changing.

Concerning the gun, which turns out to be a Smith and Wesson, the defense proposes that this might just possibly have been stolen by the deceased from the accused because, although the deceased had a Colt of his own in the bottom of his suitcase, he preferred suicide with a Smith and Wesson. Finally, in regard to the threats of the accused, these might by a remote chance have been unrelated to the shooting and due instead to cultural deprivation on the part of the accused.

On the basis of this evidence, the Court takes the case away from the jury and directs a verdict in favor of the accused. Although the accused has threatened to kill two other men in the community, his gun is returned to him and he is complimented and set free. The newspapers are loud in their praise of this verdict. A few weeks later you read in one of them that the other men who were threatened have indeed died under mysterious circumstances thought by the staff writer for this paper to be suicide. On the following Sunday you turn on your TV and you see and hear certain prominent men apologize to the accused for the inconvenience the community has caused him. In the press that same Sunday appear edi-

ting a new case heard, instead of blindly talking about their duty to enforce a judicial decision which is a nightmare scientifically, legally and morally.

Let me add one last remark about my hotel drama. Any similarity between that episode and the groups in our racial controversy is purely a coincidence. Actually and in all seriousness I intend no parallel whatever between the Negro and the accused. I leave you to judge how I feel about counsel for the defense and the other characters in the story.

The time has come for me to draw these comments to a close. Today we have celebrated the birthday of a great man. He was not only an American hero. He was beloved throughout the world. He was a devout Christian, a man of wide compassion and sensitive tenderness. We know what he thought and said about the Negro and I shan't quote him on that subject again. We know that in 1858 he made it clear that he did not favor in any way the social or political equality of the White and Black races. We also know that in 1864, when his days were nearly done, he wrote a letter to the governor of Louisiana "barely suggesting" his hope that some "very intelligent" Negroes might be admitted to the franchise—of course under the control, and at the discretion, of the states. Surely with this we may agree.

However, I think we may be equally sure that Lincoln would have had nothing but contempt for these latter-day reconstructionists sitting here in Washington and elsewhere who at bayonet point would force the Negro into schools and other social situations with White children against the wishes of their parents. He would have had nothing but contempt for a welfare agency which farms out helpless White orphans to a Negro foster home. He would not have blamed the Negro for this. If ever there was a leader who would have cleansed the temple with a lash on the backs of the real culprits, Lincoln was the man.

But Lincoln was kind. I think he would have liked Dr. Garrett's way of expressing the difference between the White and Negro races. Dr. Garrett prefers to speak less of inferiority than of racial immaturity, and I have changed this slightly so that I speak now of racial youth. Indeed I have tried to make it clear wherever I have used the word inferiority that I am referring solely to limitations in adaptability to our specific Western culture. But watch the scientists and the equalitarian press—they will always drag out the phrase "Negro inferiority charged" and put it in headlines when they attack us. Like the word racist, it is a badge of their demagoguery.

Lincoln was kind, too, in his attitude toward the South. Had he lived he would have bound up the South's wounds as well as the North's. There would have been no Reconstruction Period. And although the Fourteenth Amendment was passed after Lincoln's death, I will go so far as to say that if he could see the manner in which that Amendment is being abused today, and hurled against the South, he would turn in his grave.

So tonight I am not going to end this talk with a quotation from Lincoln about the Negro. I am going to end it with a different quotation from Lincoln which I recommend to the meditations of the two anthropological associations, and of the Supreme Court and of John F. Kennedy and of Dwight Eisenhower: "You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

I might add that you can't fool nature any of the time. Genetic racial differences in intelligence, character and behavior are the basic reality of life. As Dr. Coon has said, there is great variability in the evolutionary status of human populations all over the earth. This is the fundamental fact in the world today. National or international policy built on any other foundation is a house built on sand.